CHAPTER XV.

KRISHNARĀJA WODEYAR II, 1734-1766—(*contd.*)

Social life: 1734-1751—Vedic learning and culture—Literary activity: Karachuri Nanjarajaiya—His works: (*a*) The *Sivabhakta-Vilasa-Darpanam* and other *Saiva-Puranas* and *Mahatmyas*, *c.* 1734-1742—(*b*) The *Mahabharata*, the *Kakudgiri-Mahatmya*, the *Sangita-Gangadhara*, etc., *c.* 1742-1751—(*c*) The *Garalapuri-Mahimadarsa* (*Garalapuri-Mahatmya*), *c.* 1763-1765—The proteges of the Dalavais: Nuronda: The *Saundara-Kavya*, *c.* 1740—Krishna Dikshita: The *Dalavai Agraharam Plates* II, 1749—Kasipati-Pandita: Commentary on the *Sangita-Gangadhara*, *c.* 1748—Narasimha-Kavi: The *Nanjaraja-Yasobhushanam* (including the *Chandrakala-Kalyana*), *c.* 1748-1750; The *Sivadaya-Sahasram*—Nilakantha-Kavi: The *Nanjaraja-yasassamollasa-Champuh*, *c.* 1748-1750—Venkatesa: The *Halasya-Mahatmya*, *c.* 1763-1765—Other writers, *c.* 1740-1750: Gopalaraja: The *Kamalachala-Mahatmya*, *c.* 1740; Channarajappa: The *Venkatesvara-Sataka*, *c.* 1750; Padmaraja-Pandit: The *Vijayakumarana-Kathe*, *c.* 1750—Domestic life: Queens and children of Krishnaraja—Other members of the Royal Family—The Dalavais—Death of Krishnaraja Wodeyar, April 25, 1766—The character of his rule and the conduct of his ministers—Evil effects of wrong ministerial behaviour: loss of power and displacement by Haidar Ali—Nanjaraja's faults of character and the penalty he paid for them—Why he failed in his attempt to take Trichinopoly—Redeeming features in his character: His memorable stand for the political liberty of Southern India—Nanjaraja, the symbol of the independence of the South—His fatal mistake: lack of planning and preparation for war—The man and his idea: a justification—Nanjaraja and Bolingbroke: a comparison and a contrast—The Dalavai brothers: an estimate of their work—The

credit due to them—Results of the disaster at Trichinopoly: End of the Dalavai regime and the emergence of Haidar Ali—Krishnaraja Wodeyar II as he might have been.

INVOLVED as the kingdom was in intricate foreign politics and internal troubles continuously during 1751-1761, the social side of the reign of Krishṇarāja Woḍeyar is perhaps best seen to advantage in the period 1734-1751, an epoch marked by the ascendency of the Daḷavāis on the one hand and on the other by peace and security in the State, despite the occasional inroads of the Mahrattas and the Mughals. Of Seringapatam, during this period, we glean a picture as a flourishing city with a large resident population as busy and active as a hundred years ago. We read of it as still shining as a mediæval Hindu city ruled by a king who maintained the traditions of a revered past. With its impregnable and extensive fort (*kōṭe*) adorned by the moat, ramparts, spikes and bastions; its richly plastered mansions (*bhavana, saudha*); its magnificent Palace (*aramane*) brilliant with its many exquisitely carved halls with self-expressive names *Saundarya-Vilāsa, Chitra-śāle, Chandra-śāle, Hajāra-chāvaḍi, Navaranga-maṇṭapa* and *Bhadra-bhavana*; and its jewelled throne (*ratna-simhāsana*),[1] Seringapatam was as ever before an object of beauty and admiration. Among the attractive features of life in the capital city were the king's Durbar (*ōlaga*) in the gorgeously decorated court-hall (*Ōlaga-śāle, Hajāra-chāvaḍi*) of the Palace and the grand *Mahānavami* or *Navarātri* festival, conducted in the impressive old style.[2] Indeed the Dasara, with its elaborate programme of wrestling by jeṭṭis (*malla-yuddha, muṣṭi-yuddha*) and

Social life: 1734-1751.

1. *Saund. Kāv.*, chs. I, IV, IX-XII; also *Nanjarājayaśas. Cham.*, II. ff. 6. For an account of these and other works cited in this Chapter, see under *Literary activity* below.
2. *Ibid*, chs. I, IV, IX and XII.

the procession-in-state on the tenth day (*Pauju*), had attained considerable popularity.[3] One of Krishṇarāja Woḍeyar's Durbars held about 1740 was, it is interesting to find,[4] attended by the following among other feudatories of his, namely, Doḍḍaiya of Sāmbaḷḷi, Chaluvaiya of Anantagiri, Kāntaiya of Haradanahaḷḷi, Krishṇaiya of Maddūr, Kemparājaiya of Beḷḷūr [the conqueror of Baiche Gauḍa of (Chik) Baḷḷāpur], Alangada Narasaiya of Māgaḍi, Vīrarājaiya of Nuggehaḷḷi, Chikkaiya of Kaḍūr, Narasarājaiya of Kaḍaba, Chaluvarājaiya of Hebbūr, Muddarājaiya of Chiknāyakanahaḷḷi and Dēvarājaiya of Śūḷagiri; the chiefs of Salem (*Śālya*), Ḍenkaṇikōṭe, Hosūr, Nāmakal, Satyamaṇgalam, Coimbatore (*Coyamuttūr*), Mysore, Gaurāmbudhi, Yeḷandūr, Piriyāpaṭṇa, Hoḷe-Narasipur (*Narasimhapura*), Arkalgūḍ, Kandīkere, Turuvēkere (*Turugere*), Dēvarāya-durga, Tumkūr, Maddagiri, Kuṇigal, Huliyūr-durga and Channapaṭṇa; and the headmen (*Gurikār*) of Kikkēri, Bēlūr, Hāranahaḷḷi, Honnavaḷḷi and (?) Diṇḍigal. The festival had grown with the ages and the feudatories seemed to delight in its celebration even more than their liege-lord. Its social aspects were as much appreciated by about this time as their political.

Vedic learning and culture.

Vedic learning and culture continued to be preserved intact during the period. We have reference to the capital city of Seringapatam with its Brāhmanical tenements (*bhūsura-nikara-nivēśana*) always resplendent with the fragrant odour of the flame of sacrificial fire, whose inhabitants, leading good domestic lives, were reputed for their proficiency in Vēdic lore and disputation.[5] Among the Vēdic scholars of the time, Pradhān Venkaṭapataiya

3. *Ibid*, ch. XII.
4. *Ibid*, I, 39-82.
5. *Nanjarājayaśas. Cham.*, II. ff. 5-7: *nirantara dēdīpyamāna hōmadhūma gandha sugandhi vāta ; Vēdēshu vādēshucha atyantam chaturaḥ chaturshvapi.*

was, it is interesting to note,[6] well known for his attainments in the *Purāṇas*: he was descended from a learned family, his father Timmappārya being referred to as one who could recite the whole of the *Yajur-Vēda* and the *Āpastambha-Sūtra*.

Literary activity.

The court of Krishṇaraja Woḍeyar was the symbol of the culture and tastes of the times. Literature—sacred and secular—and the arts flourished as usual under royal patronage.

Karāchūri Nanjarājaiya.

Karāchūri Nanjarāja in literary works—was himself, we learn,[7] the foremost among the scholars of Krishṇarāja's court. An accomplished person that he was, he had mastered, and was known to have had at his fingers' ends, all arts.[8] Gifted with a nice sense of discrimination,[9] he used to take delight in the company of the learned.[10] He had been initiated into the tenets of Śaivism,[11] and had

6. See *M. A. R.*, 1923, pp. 66-70, No. 58 (1744), cited in Ch. XIV, f.n. 13 The genealogy of Venkaṭapataiya, according to this record, was as follows:

Gōvinda Ḍaṇāyaka of Kannambāḍi (*Kaṇvapuri*)

Gōpālārya
Krishṇārya } Vēdic scholars
Timmappārya

Venkaṭapati *m.* Kāvā.

7. *Sangī. Gangā.*, ff. 1: *Śrīmat-Krishṇa mahībhujō narapatēr vidvat pradhānāgraṇiḥ Śrī-Nanja-kshitipālaka.*
8. *Ibid*; also *Nanjarājayaśō.*, I. p. 5: *sakala kalānidhi*; *sarvāḥ kalāḥ śirasi kṛta hastānjali puṭaḥ.*
9. *Nānjarājayaśas. Cham.*, I. ff. 3: *sārāsāra vivēchanāti chaturaḥ.*
10. *Śiva-Gī.*, I, 13; *Śivabhakta-Vi. Dar.*, I, 12; also *Mbh. Ādi.*, ff. 1, and *Sabhā.*, ff. 118, and *Bhadragiri-Māhāt.*, col.: *budhajanaroḍane gōṣṭhiyanesagi*; *budhajana ranjane.*
11. *Ibid*, I, 15; *Ibid*, I, 14: *Pāśupata śāstrārtha tatvava . . . tiḷidu.* Here the word *Pāśupata* has to be understood as meaning "of or relating to Śiva," and not the Pāśupata school of Śaivism. Nanjarāja was a Śuddha-Śaiva. During his time, the Pāśupata school as such had nearly, if not wholly, gone out of existence. Broadly the passage may be rendered thus: "He having learnt the fundamental doctrines pertaining to the religion of Śiva."

drunk deep in the fountain of the *Śaivāgamas* and *Nigamas*, including the *Śaiva-Panchākshara*.[12] Proficient in composing poems in Sanskrit, Telugu, Kannaḍa and other languages,[13] he could study independently a gloss or commentary on a treatise or text,[14] and was held in high esteem by his contemporaries as a new Bhōja in the matter of appreciation and encouragement of literary merit (*Śrī-Nanjarājō nava-Bhōjarājaḥ*; *nūtana-Bhōjarājaḥ*).[15]

His works:

(a) The *Śivabhakta-Vilāsa-Darpaṇam* and other *Śaiva-Purāṇas* and *Māhatmyas*, c. 1734-1742.

- Most of the earlier literary productions of Nanjarāja extant are adaptations in Kannaḍa prose (*vachana-kāvya*; *ṭīku*), assignable to the period *c.* 1734-1742.[16] They generally belong to a series entitled *Nanjarāja-Vāṇī-Vilāsa* and deal with Śaiva-Purāṇas, ritualism and philosophy. They are written in intelligible modern Kannaḍa (*achcha Kannaḍa*) for popular edification (*akhilararivante*), and begin with invocations, among others, to Śiva, Gaṇēśa, Nīlakaṇṭha-Bhāshyakāra (Śrīkaṇṭhāchārya), Haradattāchārya and Sundarēśvarāchārya, some of the works[17] being preceded also by a short poetical account of the pedigree of Nanjarāja (*i.e.*, of the Kaḷale Family). Thus he rendered from Sanskrit the *Śivabhakta-Vilāsa-Darpaṇam* (in 90 chapters),[18]

12. *Ibid*, I, 13-14; *Ibid*, I, 12-13: *vara Śivāgama nigamadarthavanaridu.*
13. *Mbh. Sabhā.*, l.c.; also *Mārkaṇḍēya-Purāṇa*, col.; *Śivabhakta-Vi. Dar.*, col.; and *Bhadragiri-Māhāt.*, l.c.: *Girvāṇāndhra Karṇāṭakādi nānā bhāshā viśēsha kāvya rachanā chāturī dhurīṇa.*
14. *Nanjarājayaśō.*, I. p. 4: *svayam vyākhyā pīṭhimadhivasati.*
15. *Ibid*, VI. p. 89.
16. Nanjarāja, as he tells us, began the *Ādi-Parva* of his *Mahābhārata* in 1742 (*Ś.* 1664, *Dundubhi*), just at a time when he had finished his major works on *Śaiva-Purāṇas*, such as *Hālāsya-Māhātmya*, *Śivabhakta-Vilāsa-Darpaṇam*, *Bhadragiri-Māhātmya*, etc. (see *Mbh. Ādi.*, ff. 1). This enables us to assign these earlier works of his to *c.* 1734-1742. See also and compare *Kar. Ka. Cha.*, III, 40-47.
17. See, for instance, the *Śiva-Gī.* and the *Śivabhakta-Vi. Dar.*
18. Mss. Nos. A. 136 and 229—*P.*; *Mys. Or. Lib.*; also No. 18-18-9—*P. L.*; *Mad. Or. Lib.* We have also, in palm leaf, a Telugu version of this

dealing with the *Śivabhakta-Māhātmya* of the *Skāndōpa-Purāṇa* of Vyāsa; *Śivadharmōttara-Vachana* or *Purāṇa* (in 50 chapters),[19] and the *Sētumahimādarśa* (in 52 chapters)[20] of the *Skānda-Purāṇa*; *Śiva-Gīte* (in 16 chapters)[21] of the *Padma-Purāṇa*; *Linga-Purāṇa* (in two parts of 108 and 50 chapters respectively);[22] *Mārkaṇḍēya-Purāṇa* (*Tātparya-dīpike*);[23] *Bhadragiri-Māhātmya* (in 16 chapters),[24] dealing with the legendary history of Bhadragiri as told in the *Brahmāṇḍa-Purāṇa*; *Hālāsya-Māhātmya* (in 71 chapters),[25] depicting the sixty-four sports of Sundarēśvara of Madura, as narrated in the *Agastya-Samhitā* of the *Skānda-Purāṇa*; *Haradattāchārya-Māhātmya* (in 10 chapters),[26] describing the life-history of Haradattāchārya, the Śaiva preceptor, according to the *Bhavishyōttara-Purāṇa*; and the *Vighnēśvara-Vrata-Kalpa* (in three parts, namely, *Syamantakōpākhyāna*, *Sankaṣṭahara-Chaturthī-Vrata* and *Dhuṇḍī-Vināyaka-Charitre*),[27] dealing with the worship of Gaṇēśa as prescribed in the *Bhavishyōttara-Purāṇa* and the *Kāśimahimārtha-Darpaṇam* of the *Skānda-Purāṇa*.

---

work—known as *Śivabhakta-Vilāsam*—ascribed to Nanjarāja. This has been brought to our notice by Mr. M. Venkata Reddi, Nosam, Kurnool district.

19. Ms. No. 18-20-16—*P. L.*; *Mad. Or. Lib.*
20. See *Kar. Ka. Cha.*, III. 46.
21. Ms. No. 18-4-19—*P. L.*; *Mad. Or. Lib.*; also Ms. No. A. 128—*P.*; *Mys. Or. Lib.*
22. Ms. No. 19-2-37—*P.*; *Mad. Or. Lib.*; also No. 19-13-25—*P. L.*; *Mad. Or. Lib.*
23. Ms. No. K. 46—*P. L.*; *Mys. Or. Lib.*
24. Ms. No. 18-13-14—*P. L.*; *Mad. Or. Lib.* Bhadragiri: a hill to the south-west of the confluence of rivers Pinākinī and Vahnī.
25. Ms. No. 19-3-55—*P.*; *Mad. Or. Lib.*; also No. A. 199—*P.*; *Mys. Or. Lib.* There are three Mss. of this work in the *Mad. Or. Lib.* and four in the *Mys. Or. Lib.* Nanjarāja is known to have written a Telugu version also of the *Hālāsya-Māhātmya*.
26. Ms. No. 185—*P. L.*; *Mys. Or. Lib.*
27. Ms. No. B. 259—*P.*; *Mys. Or. Lib.* See also *Des. Cat. Kan. Mss.* of the *Mad. Or. Lib.*, II, item Nos. 249, 251 and 278.

(b) The *Mahābhārata*, the *Kakudgiri-Māhātmya*, the *Sangīta-Gangādhara*, etc., *c.* 1742-1751.

Between 1742-1751 Nanjarāja seems to have been engaged in the preparation of a modern Kannaḍa prose version of the *Mahābhārata* (*Mahābhārata-tātparya-ṭīkū*),[28] also under the series *Nanjarāja-Vāṇī-Vilāsa*, of which the following portions are extant: the *Ādi-Parva* (in 199 chapters),[29] *Sabhā-Parva* (in 132 chapters),[30] *Ānuśāsanika-Parva*, *Drōṇa-Parva*, *Śalya-Parva* and *Sauptika-Parva*,[31] and the *Hari-Vaṁśa* (in 101 chapters).[32] About 1748-1749 Nanjarāja appears to have rendered into Kannaḍa the *Kakudgiri-Māhātmya*,[33] a prose work (in 20 chapters) treating of the sanctity of Śivaganga according to the *Tīrtha-Khaṇḍa* of the *Skānda-Purāṇa*. The version is otherwise known as *Sajjana-Karṇa-rasāyana* (*Sajjana-Karṇa-rasāyanamembī ṭīku*), meaning literally, pleasing to the ears of the good (*i.e.*, devotees of Śiva). It begins, like his earlier works, with the introductory chapter—dealing with his pedigree—referring also to his expedition to Dhārānagar (*c.* 1746) and siege of Dēvanahaḷḷi (1746-1747).[34] Nanjarāja is further credited with having written the *Sangīta-Gangādhara* and numerous other works in Sanskrit. Only the *Sangīta-Gangādhara*

---

28. In view of what has been stated in f.n. 16 *supra*, the entire series of Nanjarāja's prose version of the *Mahābhārata* has to be fixed in the period *c.* 1742-1751. Some of his later works, noticed above, are also assignable to this period, since he was during 1751-1761 engrossed in public affairs which should have kept him away from steady literary pursuits.
29. Ms. No. 18-21-13—*P. L.*; *Mad. Or. Lib.*
30. Ms. No. 18-16-12—*P. L.*; *Mad. Or. Lib.*
31. Mss. Nos. 18-16-17 and 18-20-11—*P. L.*; *Mad. Or. Lib.* See also *Des. Cat. Kan. Mss.* of the *Mad. Or. Lib.*, I, item Nos. 103 and 107.
32. Ms. No. 104 (*P. L.*) in the *Maharaja's Sanskrit College Library, Mysore.*
33. Ms. No. 156—*P. L.*; *Mys. Or. Lib.*; also No. B. 286—*P.*; *Mys. Or. Lib.*
34. See *Nanjarājayaśō.*, VI p. 89: *tatkavi-samakshamēva kṛti-nāyakēna Kalulē kula chirantana sukṛta paripākēna svakapōla kalpita Sangīta-Gangādharādyanēka prabandhābhinaya darśanajanita kautukēna . . . Nanjarājēna.*

(*c.* 1745-1748), however, has so far come down to us.[35] It is an epic poem in six cantos, modelled in the main on Jayadēva's *Gīta-Gōvinda*. The work begins as usual with invocations to Śiva and an account of the genealogy, etc., of the author, and centres round the sports of Śiva with the wives of the hermits of Dārukavana, the resulting estrangement from Pārvati, the separation and sufferings of the couple, the intercession of the maid, the reconciliation, the re-union and the joys of Śiva and Pārvati. Alike in point of subject-matter and method of treatment, the poem is to be reckoned a contribution of unique interest to the devotional literature in Śaivism.

Between 1751 and 1761, Nanjarāja does not seem to have produced any literary works, fully engrossed as he was in political and military affairs. Perhaps the latest available production of Nanjarāja is the *Garaḷapuri-Mahimādarśa* (*Garaḷapuri-Māhātmya*) (*c.* 1763-1765),[36] a Kannaḍa prose work (*ṭīku*) in twelve chapters, treating of the sanctity of Nanjangūḍ as dealt with in the *Skānda-Purāṇa*. The occasion for the writing of this work was the inauguration by Nanjarāja of the *Nanjarāja-Tirunāḷu* about 1763.[37] When completed, it was, we are told,[38] dedicated by him to Śrī-Nanjuṇḍēśvara of Nanjangūḍ.

(*c*) The *Garaḷapuri-Mahimādarśa* (*Garaḷapuri-Māhātmya*), *c.* 1763-1765.

35. Ms. No. 4422 (with text and commentary in *Telugu* characters)—*P. L.*; *Mys. Or. Lib.* See ff. 1, where the commentator refers to the author and his work thus : *Śrī-Nanja-kshitipālakēna rachitam Sangīta-Gangādharam; Śrī-Nanjarāja nāmā mahākaviḥ . . . Sangīta-Gangādharābhidhānam mahā-kāvyam ārabhamāṇaḥ.* The text of the poem has lately been edited and published by Mr. M. R. Sakhare, Belgaum. The commentary is separately noticed above.

36. Ms. Nos. K. 405 (*P. L.*) and A. 20 (*P.*) in the *Mys. Or. Lib.*; see also *Des. Cat. Kan. Mss.* of the *Mad. Or.-Lib.*, II, item No. 253.

37. *Vide* col. to item No. 253 in *Ibid.*

38. *Ibid*

The protèges of the Daḷavāis:

Under the direct patronage of the Daḷavāis, Nūronda wrote the *Saundara-Kāvya* (*c.* 1740),[39] a Kannaḍa poem in thirteen chapters (*sandhi*). The poet seems to have been a resident of Seringapatam, since he shows a close acquaintance with that place[40] and constantly refers to the local gods thereof (*i.e.*, Gangādharēśvara and Ranganātha).[41] He appears too as a devout Vīra-Śaiva with a tolerant outlook on life. He mentions Tōṇṭada-Siddēśvara of Yeḍeyūr (a deified Vīra-Śaiva saint and poet, *c.* 1470),[42] and begins each chapter generally with invocation to Śaiva deities (as, for instance, Triṇēśa, Nanjuṇḍēśvara, Gangādharēśvara, Pārvati, Chāmuṇḍi, etc.), occasionally praising Vishṇu as well (for instance, in the manifestations of Śankara-Nārāyaṇa, Ranganātha, Vēṇugōpāla-Krishṇa, etc.).[43] The poem is written in the colloquial *Sāngatya* metre. Curiously enough, it is conspicuous by the absence of any Śaivite topic as its theme but deals for the most part with the exploits of Daḷavāi Dēvarājaiya and Karāchūri Nanjarājaiya during the invasion of Mysore by the Nawāb of Arcot (1737).[44] The poet not infrequently eulogises the Daḷavāis,[45] and exhibits an intimate knowledge of the court of Krishṇarāja Woḍeyar and of life in Seringapatam.[46] The

Nūronda:

The *Saundara-Kāvya*, *c.* 1740.

39. Ms. No. B. 285—*P.*; *Mys. Or. Lib.* In ch. XIII, v. 162, we are told that the *Saundara-Kāvya* was begun on *Kārtīka śu.* 10 and completed on *Āśvīja śu.* 10, the cyclic year, however, not being mentioned. But at the very end of the Ms. is a passage referring to its completion on *Dhātu, Mārgaśira ba.* 10, which corresponds to December 17, 1756. Probably a copy of the work was made by the scribe in 1756. In any case the *Saundara-Kāvya* appears to have been written not earlier than 1740 and not later than 1756. See also and compare *Kar. Ka. Cha.*, III. 47-50.

40. See ch. I.

41. See chs. I, II, V, VIII-XI, and XIII.

42. See ch. XIII, v. 95.

43. *Vide* chs. IV-VII, IX, XI and XII.

44. *Vide* chs. V-X. For details, *vide* Ch. IV, pp. 74-77, of this vol.

45. See chs. II, IV-X.

46. See chs. I-IV, IX-XII.

Saundara-Kāvya bears, on the whole, ample testimony to the ascendency of the Daḷavāis in Mysore during the early years of Krishṇarāja's reign and is of considerable value for the social, and no less political, history of the times.

Krishṇa Dīkshita: The *Daḷavāi Agraḥāram Plates* II, 1749.

Krishṇa Dīkshita of Kāśyapa-gōtra and Sāma-śākhā, a scholar of the court of Krishṇarāja Woḍeyar, composed the *Daḷavāi Agrahāram Plates* II (1749) issued by Daḷavāi Dēvarājaiya.[47] This inscription, in sixteen plates, is in a mixture of Sanskrit and Kannaḍa, the Sanskrit portion, dealing with the pedigree, etc., of the Mysore rulers and the Daḷavāis, being written in the usual *Kāvya* style. Krishṇa Dīkshita composed also the *Hampāpur Plate* (1744), another record in Sanskrit.[48]

Kāśīpati-Paṇḍita: Commentary on the *Sangīta-Gangādhara*, *c.* 1748.

Among the protèges of Karāchūri Nanjarājaiya, in particular, Kāśīpati-Paṇḍita, son of Umāpati-Paṇḍita of Kauṇḍinya-gōtra, wrote a commentary in Sanskrit, entitled *Śravaṇa-Nandinī* (*c.* 1748),[49] on the *Sangīta-Gangādhara* of Nanjarāja. His commentary is, as it were, a treatise on poetics and he refers in it to a *Bhāṇa* by name *Mukundānanda*, and to *Bhāva-Prakāśikā* and *Kāvyādarśa* among earlier works on poetics.[50] Kāśīpati-Paṇḍita is most unstinted in his admiration of the poetical talents of his patron.[51] And he is himself highly spoken of by his own contemporaries as a versatile scholar and poet.[52]

47. *E.C.*, III (1) TN. 63, ll. 1388-1389.
48. *Vide* f.n. 6 *supra*.
49. See ff. 1 of the Ms. of *Sangīta-Gangādhara*, cited in f.n. 35 *supra*; also col. at the end of each canto.
50 *Ibid.*
51. *Ibid*, where Kāśīpati-Paṇḍita speaks of Nanjarāja as *Mahākaviḥ sakala kalānidhiḥ*, etc.
52. *Nanjarājayaśō.*, VI. p. 89: *sakalakalā kuśalamatinā sarasa-kavi-chakra-vartinā Kāśīpati sudhīmaṇinā.*

Narasimha-Kavi:

The *Nanjarāja-Yaśōbhūshaṇam* (including the *Chandrakalā-Kalyāṇa*), *c.* 1748-1750.

Narasimha-Kavi, of Sanagara-Kula and son of a scholar by name Śivarāma,[53] wrote the *Nanjarāja-Yaśōbhūshaṇam* (*c.* 1748-1750).[54] The poet was the disciple of a religious preceptor by name Yōgānanda-Yatīndra,[55] and was, we learn,[56] one of those who followed the established standards of good literary composition, having mastered the *Śāstras* and literature,[57] probably under his own father.[58] He had a friend and colleague in one Tirumala-Kavi of Ālūr, styled Nava-Bhavabhūti.[59] Narasimha-Kavi had attained considerable popularity as Ṇava-Kāḷidāsa (*nava-Kālidāsaḥ*; *navīna Kālidāsaḥ*),[60] highly esteemed by his contemporaries[61] and honoured by his patron Nanjarāja himself, the Nava-Bhōjarāja.[62] The *Nanjarāja-Yaśōbhūshaṇam* is a treatise in Sanskrit on the science of poetics (*alankāra-śāstra*). It begins with invocations to Sarasvati, Śambhu and Yōgānanda-Yatīndra-Guru, and extends to seven chapters (*vilāsa*) dealing respectively with the exposition of the characteristics of the poetic hero (*nāyaka nirūpaṇam*), nature of poetical composition (*ḳāvya svarūpa nirūpaṇam*), implied meanings of expressions (*dhvani nirūpaṇam*), sentiments (*rasa nirūpaṇam*), merits and defects of rhetorical writing (*dōsha-guṇa nirūpaṇam*), dramaturgy (*nāṭaka prakaraṇam*) and figures (*alankāra prakaraṇam*).

53. *Ibid*; also I. p. 1, v. 4; and col. to ch.
54. Pub. *Gaekwad's Oriental Series*, No. XLVII; see also and compare Mss. Nos. 467, 3904, 4019 and 4381—*P. L.*; *Mys. Or. Lib.* The citations are from the published work.
55. I. p. 1, v. 3.
56. See col.: *sarasa sāhitya sampradāya pravartaka.*
57. VI. p. 89: *śāstra sāhityayōrapi nitānta niṣṇāta.*
58. See col., where he says: *Śrī-paramaśivāvatāra Śivarāmadēśika charaṇāravindānusandhāna mahimā samāsādita.*
59. VII. p. 223: *Ālūra Tirumala-Kavērabhinava-Bhavabhūti nāma birudasya suhṛdā.*
60. VI. p. 89; VII. l.c.
61. *Ibid*: *sarasakavīnām puratō gaṇanīyasyāsya.*
62. *Ibid*: *nūtana-Bhōjarājēna Nanjarājēna sabahumānāhūtaḥ.*

The subject-matter of each chapter is suitably illustrated by the poet's own verses eulogistic of his patron Nanjarāja, whence the name of the work. The chapter on dramaturgy is of especial interest to us, as it embodies, by way of illustration, a play in five acts, named *Chandrakalā-Kalyāṇa*,[63] intended to be enacted before a learned audience—including perhaps Nanjarāja also—assembled on the occasion of *Vasantōtsava* of Śrī-Nanjuṇḍēśvara of Nanjangūḍ.[64] In respect of treatment of the science of poetics in general, Narasimha-Kavi follows closely the *Pratāparudra-Yaśōbhūshaṇam* of Vidyānātha, though at times he differs from, and is more elaborate than, the latter.[65] He shows also intimate acquaintance with such earlier works on the subject as *Daśarūpaka*, *Kāvyaprakāśa*, *Śringāratilaka* and *Nānārtharatnamālā*;[66] quotes from Jayadēva and Kaiśiki;[67] and makes mention of the *Raghuvaṁśa*, *Kādambari*, *Harsha-Charita*, *Sūrya-Śataka*, *Mahāvīra-Charita* and *Uttararāma-Charita*.[68] The *Nanjarāja-Yaśōbhūshaṇam* is decidedly later than the *Sangīta-Gangādhara*, *Śivabhakta-Vilāsa-Darpaṇam* and other works of Nānjarāja, to all which it refers.[69] It undoubtedly is an index of the greatness of Karāchūri Nanjarājaiya during 1748-1751 when he was at the height of his power and glory in the kingdom of Mysore. Narasimha-Kavi has also written the *Śivadayā - Sahasram*,[70] another work in Sanskrit, in ten chapters (*aṁśa*).

The Śivadayā-Sahasram.

63. See VI. pp. 87-154.
64. See VI. p. 88: *Garalanagarābharaṇāyamānasya bhagavatō Garala-purīśvarasya vasantōtsavē sasantōshamaśēsha digantōpasēdushā-mamīshāṁ rasika vidushāmabhilashita sampādana ēva.*
65. As, for instance, in respect of *Dhvani*.
66. See pp. 32, 37, 38, 84, 87, 154 and 159.
67. See pp. 2, 16 and 18.
68. See pp. 36 and 84.
69. See VI. p. 89: *Karṇāṭaka bhāshā virachita Hālāsya-Charita Śivabhakta-Vilāsādi bahuvidha prabandha samudāyēna . . . Nanjarājēna.*
70. Ms. No. B. 72—*P.*; *Mys. Or. Lib.*

Nīlakaṇṭha-Kavi: The *Nanjarājayaśassamōllāsa-Champūḥ*, *c.* 1748-1750.

Almost contemporaneously with the *Nanjarāja-Yaśōbhūshaṇam*, Nīlakaṇṭha-Kavi wrote the *Nanjarājayaśassamōllāsa-Champūḥ* (*c.* 1748-1750),[71] an epic poem, also in Sanskrit, in three cantos (*ullāsa*), eulogising Nanjarāja. The latest event referred to in the work is Nanjarāja's acquisition of Dhārānagar (*c.* 1746), and he is himself mentioned as the virtual ruler of the kingdom of Mysore with Seringapatam as its capital.[72] The poem begins with invocations to Lakshmī-Narasimha, Śiva, Gaṇēśa and Ranganātha. Throughout, the poet shows an intimate acquaintance with his patron Nañjarāja, the capital city of Seringapatam and the court of Krishṇarāja Woḍeyar.

Venkaṭēśa: The *Hālāsya-Māhātmya*, *c.* 1763-1765.

Venkaṭēśa of Paurukutsa-gōtra and Āpastambha-sūtra, a resident of Gummaḷāpura, wrote the *Hālāsya-Māhātmya* (*c.* 1763-1765),[73] a *champu* in Kannaḍa. The poet appears to have composed this work at the desire of Nanjarāja, just at a time when the latter had completed his pious services in the Nanjuṇḍēśvara temple at Nanjangūḍ (*i.e.*, construction of the tower, enclosure and miniature temples, setting up of images of Śaiva saints and the writing of their history, *c.* 1756-1763).

Other writers, *c.* 1740-1750:

Among other writers of the period, Gōpālarāja (Katti Gōpālarāja Urs of Beṭṭadakōṭe, father-in-law of Krishṇarāja Woḍeyar) wrote the *Kamalāchala-Māhātmya* (*c.* 1740),[74]

71. Ms. No. B. 999—*P.*; *Mys. Or. Lib.*

72. See ff. 16: *Śrīrangarājadhānī rājyapālakaḥ . . . Śrīmān Nanja-Bhūpālakaḥ*. As in the *Śringārarājatilaka-Bhāṇaḥ* (*Ante* Ch. III), the capital city of Seringapatam is also referred to in this work by the name of *Karivaradarāja-pura* after the presiding deity Ranganātha or Karivarada of the place (*Karīdapuravarābhidhānā rājadhānī*) (see ff. 6, 7).

73. See *Kar. Ka. Cha.*, III. 50-53. This work fixes the author in or about 1740 but from the internal evidence above referred to, the *Hālāsya-Māhātmya* of Venkaṭēśa appears to have been written not earlier than *c.* 1763.

74. Ms. No. 279—*P. L.*; *Mys. Or. Lib.* See also and compare *Kar. Ka. Cha.*, III. 53-54.

a Kannaḍa prose version of the legendary history of Kamalāchala (Gōpālasvāmi hill) as told in the *Bhavishyōttara-Purāṇa*. The work is in ten chapters and is also known as *Śrī-Gōpāla-Bhūpālōkti-Vilāsa*.[75] Channarājappa of the Ānegondi family in Mysore composed the *Venkaṭēśvara-Śataka* (*c.* 1750),[76] a religio-philosophical poem in Kannaḍa in 103 stanzas. Lastly, Padmarāja-Paṇḍit of Mysore, son of Śānta-Paṇḍit and disciple of Akalanka-Muni, a celebrated Jain teacher and disputant (*Guru*; *Vāda-vādīśvara*; *Vādi-Pitāmaha*), wrote the *Vijaya-kumārana-Kathe* (*c.* 1750),[77] a Kannaḍa poetical work in the *Yakshagāna* metre.

Gōpālarāja :

The *Kamalāchala-Māhātmya*, *c.* 1740.

Channarājappa :

The *Venkaṭēśvara-Śataka*, *c.* 1750.

Padmarāja. Paṇḍit :

The *Vijaya-kumārana-Kathe*, *c.* 1750.

Dēvājamma of Kaḷale, daughter of Karāchūri Nanjarājaiya by his first wife, was the principal queen of Krishṇarāja Woḍeyar, to whom he was wedded in 1746 (*Akshaya*).[78] He had also two junior queens, namely, Dēvājamma of Biḷuguli and Lakshmamma (afterwards celebrated as Mahārāṇi Lakshmammaṇṇiyavaru), a daughter of Katti Gōpālarāja Urs of Beṭṭadakōṭe, both of whom were married to him in or about February 1760 (*Pramāthi*, *Māgha*).[79] An inscription on a silver plate in the Lakshmīkāntasvāmi

Domestic life :

Queens and children of Krishṇarāja.

75. See col. to ch.

76. Ms. No. B. 168—*P.*; *Mys. Or. Lib.* See also and compare *Ibid*, 93-94.

77. Ms. No. B. 257—*P.*; *Mys. Or. Lib.* See also and compare *Ibid*, 100.

78. *Annals*, I. 173. Cf. *Mys. Rāj. Cha.* (42) which seems ambiguously to place this event in 1744 (*Raktākshi*).

79. *Ibid*; also *Rāj. Kath.*, XII. 490 (compared). A *nirūpa* of Krishṇarāja Woḍeyar, dated in 1760 and addressed to Chikkaiya, Superintendent of the *Mysūru-Nagarada-Hōbaḷi-Sīme*, speaks of the grant of an *umbaḷi* of the revenue value of 60 *varahas* in the said *sīme* to one Channa for having prepared the ornamented seat (*hase-jagali*) on the occasion of the king's marriage (see *M. A. R.*, 1918, p. 59, para 131). The reference here is obviously to the wedding of 1760, mentioned above.

temple at Kaḷale refers to it as a pious gift of Lakshmamma to that temple.[80] By his principal queen, Krishṇarāja Woḍeyar had two sons (Nanjarāja Woḍeyar and Beṭṭada Chāmarāja Woḍeyar) and two daughters (Dēpājamma and Dēvājamma); by the second he had a son (Dēvarāja Woḍeyar) who is said to have died in his infancy; and by the last queen Lakshmamma a daughter (Chāmamma).[81]

Other members of the Royal Family.

Among other members of the Royal Family during the period was Dēvājamma of Kaḷale—well-known as Doḍḍamma—the senior dowager queen of Doḍḍa-Krishṇarāja Woḍeyar and adoptive mother of (Chikka) Krishṇarāja. She appears to have lived till about 1767, if not still later. On September 11, 1761, Krishṇarāja Woḍeyar got an *agrahāra* formed in her name (*Dēvāmbāsamudra*) and bestowed it on Brāhmans.[82]

The Daḷavāis.

Among the members of the Daḷavāi family, Sarvādhikāri Nanjarājaiya, cousin brother of Dēvarājaiya and Karāchūri Nanjarājaiya, had, according to one source,[83] four wives, the principal of whom was Chandāyamma. He, however, had no issue. Daḷavāi Dēvarājaiya had two consorts,[84] the second of whom Chalvājamāmbā (Chaluvājamma, daughter of Dēvarāja Urs of Śādamangala) is depicted in the *Daḷavāi Agrahāram Plates* II (1749) as an ideal lady, beautiful, generous, kind-hearted, and ever devoted to her husband.[85] By her Dēvarājaiya had sons who, however, it is said,[86] died

80. *M. A. R.*, 1917, p. 59, para 144.
81. *Annals*, l.c.
82. *E.C.*, IV (2) Yd. 18 (cited in Ch. XIV, f.n. 28), ll. 99-101: *Śrī-Dēvāmbāsamudrābhidham . . . svamāturnāmnā chaivāgrahāram pramudita hṛdayaḥ kārayāmāsa.* See also *Ante* Ch. XIII, f. n. 4.
83. *K. A. V.*, ff. 19.
84. *Ibid*, ff. 19-20.
85. *E.C.*, III (1) TN. 63, ll. 69-72.
86. *K. A. V.*, ff. 20.

in their infancy. His brother Karāchūri Nanjarājaiya had four wives,[87] by the first of whom Channājamma (daughter of Doḍḍaiya Urs of Ḍenkaṇikōṭe) he had a daughter (Puṭṭamma *alias* Dēvājamma, wedded to Krishṇarāja Woḍeyar as already mentioned),[88] and by the second Dēvājamma (daughter of Vīrarāja Urs of Nilasōge) a son by name Puṭṭa-Vīrarāja Urs,[89] identical with Vīrarājaiya or Vīrarāya Woḍeyar of Mysore, mentioned in a lithic record dated February 14, 1761.[90] The record relates to his (Vīrarājaiya's) having set up the image of Rāmēśvara in the enclosure of the local temple at Rāmanāthpur and to his having made a grant in Siridanūr to provide for the offerings, etc., to the God.

Death of Krishṇarāja Woḍeyar, April 25, 1766.

Krishṇarāja Woḍeyar passed away on April 25, 1766, in his thirty-eighth year, his queens not observing *sati*.[91]

The character of his rule and the conduct of his ministers.

The life of Immaḍi-Krishṇarāja Woḍeyar was cast in difficult times. His reign aptly illustrates the dangers of infant rule during critical periods in the history of a country. Installed on the throne in his sixth year, it was his particular misfortune to remain under the perpetual tutelage and the all-powerful sway of the Ḍaḷavāis for over two decades (1734-1755). So complete was their domination over the affairs of Mysore during the period that even after Krishṇarāja attained the age of discretion in 1746, he had hardly any scope allowed him for the assertion of his own will in State

87. *Ibid.*
88. *Ibid.*
89. *Ibid.*
90. *E.C.*, V (1) and (2) Ag. 60: *Ś.* 1683, *Vikrama*, *Māgha śu* (?) 10. The *Haid. Nām.* (ff. 72) also mentions Ḍaḷavāi Vīrarājaiya, son of Karāchūri Nanjarājaiya. According to the *K. A. V.* (ff. 34), Vīrarājaiya was nominated to the post of Ḍaḷavāi under H. H. Śrī-Krishṇarāja Woḍeyar III, and held office during 1818-1826. Evidently he lived for over half a century after his father's death (in or about 1773).
91. *Annals*, I. 202: *Vyaya*, *Nija-Chaitra ba.* 1. See also *Mys. Rāj. Cha.*, 44.

matters. The selection of an infant to succeed Chāmarāja was a *coup de maître* on their part. It placed regal power in their hands and enabled them to exercise sovereign rights much as they liked. So real was the exercise of these rights that they came to displace the sovereign himself in the public eye. It never seems to have struck them that they were setting a bad example. And not until each of them fell from power, did they seem to realize the enormity of their crime towards their king and country. The ideā of servant and master, of duty and obedience, never appealed to them. If they had thought of the king and of their responsibility to him, they would have recognised the existence of a restraint on themselves. They failed to mind the majesty of the sovereign above them. They did not, indeed, take a pride in the greatness of their own master. They forgot the Purāṇic injunction that ministers should not only protect the country but also the king.[92] They failed in their duty, and those who came after them proved worse. Whatever may be said of Dēvarājaiya, Nanjārājaiya, who knew well the religious texts and the injunctions—for he had not only read them but also commented on some of them—had no excuse to transgress the bounds set to ministers in their relations towards their Sovereign. And his unpopularity was so great that at the time he fell in 1759 there was none to sympathise with him, none even to shed a tear over his departure from Seringapatam where he had been in supreme control for years. Such is the over-mastering effect of power on a person in authority that he forgets himself and becomes wholly unable to distinguish between right and wrong. Nanjarāja's attitude

92. The *Agni-Purāṇa* thus sets down the duties of ministers:—"Deliberating upon the measures of the State, taking steps for the success of undertakings, preparing for all future contingencies, supervising the Royal Exchequer, drafting civil and criminal laws for the realm, checking encroachments by any foreign power, taking steps for arresting the progress of disturbances, and protecting the king and the country" (*Agni-Purāṇa*, CCXLI, Sls. 16-17).

towards his sovereign was not only morally wrong but also a political crime against him and his own country.

Evil effects of wrong ministerial behaviour: loss of power and displacement by Haidar Alī.

Haidar was successively the servant, the pupil, the enemy and the deceiver of Nanjarāja. At the age of thirty-three (or thirty-eight) years, and in obedience to his patron's summons, he assumed control of Diṇḍigal (1755). But as Nanjarāja had advanced in age and become weakened in authority, Haidar repented of the rash promises of his youth. He neither respected his engagements nor the loyalty he owed his old master and protector. He no longer entertained the same reverence for Nanjarāja. His ambition was to supplant him and he succeeded in doing so. If Haidar displaced him, it was Nanjarāja's fault, nay, the result of his political shortsightedness. His blindness to his own faults was phenomenal. It would not have been so pitiable had it not been so wicked. The country suffered as much from the treachery of the one as from the treason of the other.

Nanjarāja's faults of character and the penalty he paid for them.

Where Nanjarāja showed the way, Haidar only followed; where Nanjarāja was a failure, Haidar saw clearly the way to success. If Nanjarāja had only been faithful and loyal towards his sovereign, if only he had conserved and not frittered his energies, if only he had concentrated on his objective and not wasted his time over vain endeavours to get from diplomacy what he should have obtained by the use of the sword, and if only he had kept his counsel and not betrayed himself into the hands of Murāri Rao, he would have won his way through at Trichinopoly. But he was not destined to fly the Mysore flag over that great fortress—just because of his tortuous diplomacy and more tortuous methods of buying aid from pepole who were determined on not extending their aid to him. Instead of

a quiet occupation, he found a siege; his soldiers panted and died on the burning sands of the river-bed at Trichinopoly; his own country was overrun by the Mahrattas; and his retreat proved the signal for the final extinguishment of all claims over the city, on whose conquest he had set his heart and wasted his men and money.

Why he failed in his attempt to take Trichinopoly.

A more spirited man, a man in whom action dominated more than ambition, would have acted differently. He would have proved himself a very Julian in the prosecution of his objective.[93] When, on the death of Chandā Sāhib, he saw that his moderate and respectful demand for the treaty, far from being fulfilled, served only to harden the heart of Muhammad Alī, his implacable adversary, he should have boldly resolved to commit his life and fortune to the arbitrament of immediate war. He yielded foolishly to the delays and deceptions practised on him by Muhammad Alī and this led him in turn to try deception on others. He failed to note that Salābat Jang's forces were far away; that the country round about was feebly guarded but for the handful of the English; and that he could occupy, if he willed it, the fortress of Trichinopoly by a decisive attempt on it. He should have assembled his troops, being in possession of the country round about; divided his army; and struck a blow for himself. He could have divided one body against the defenders; another to guard the passes open to his own capital; and a third to keep up communications between himself and his capital. He

93. Julian Augustus, commonly styled the Apostate, for he renounced Christianity: Roman Emperor for eighteen months, 361-363 A.D. A capable soldier, a vigorous administrator and a wise ruler. Though painted in blackest colours by the Christian Fathers, he was a lover of truth, chaste, abstinent, just and affectionate, if somewhat vain and superstitious. Such is the estimate of Gibbon, who describes him as an "extraordinary man," as great in philosophy as in the field of Mars. Gibbon's description of the manner in which he prepared for war against Constantius is a masterpiece in word-picture which can hardly be surpassed.

neither lacked men nor money. And he could have ordered more levies, for he had ample resources. He had, besides, Murāri Rao's troops. He could have used them to purpose. He should have directed Murāri to scour the country in two directions and join him under the walls of Trichinopoly. Instead he allowed him to do nothing but try to secure the fortress for himself by playing false to his paymaster. What is most extraordinary, he himself did nothing. He reserved no task for himself, except that of tortuous diplomacy or unskilful attempts at bribery. On the other hand, he should have resolved to keep to himself the most dangerous part of the whole business. He should have selected the bravest of the brave among his troops, a sufficiency of men, intrepid and active, and ready to lay down their lives for him, and, like himself, prepared to cast behind them all hope of turning back. At the head of such a faithful band, he should have fearlessly plunged in an attack on the fortress, choosing his own time for it. The secrecy of his plan, the suddenness of his attack, the surprise he would have created for the besieged, his discipline and vigour, would have surmounted all obstacles. The labour of his men would have done the rest. And he would have won his objective before his enemies had had time to recover from the shock of the attack or even received news of it. The inhabitants round about would have opened their gates to him; and the possession of the strongest, the most sacred, the most famous and the most populous of the cities of the South would have been followed by the submission of all the neighbouring districts down to Cape Comorin. The object of the treaty would have been realised. Not only that. The intelligence of such rapid action would have been speedily transmitted to his enemies—Salābat Jang, the Mahrattas and the French—and they would have been confounded by the celerity displayed

by their rival. But Nanjarāja was not the man for such quickness, decision, or promptitude. Nor was he capable of soldierly action or blessed with the prescience of a fighting general. Indeed, he failed to watch events that were happening round about him with the eye of a general. He chose to fight Muhammad Alī and his confreres not with the arms and ammunition he had so plenteously provided himself with but with the weapon of political machination, in which he was no match for them. He was a poor judge of men and a poorer judge of his own capacity. His character was a compound of ambition and cruelty, of pride and weakness, of vacillation and intrigues, of double-dealing and corruption. He lacked the essential qualities of a leader of men and possessed not the genius of a conqueror. His long abuse of power, no doubt, had won for him a spurious reputation among his contemporaries as the virtual ruler of a great kingdom, but, as personal merit can alone deserve the respect of posterity, Nanjarāja, it must be confessed, inherited a great office without the ability to make good in it.

Redeeming features in his character; His memorable stand for the political liberty of South India.

But there were certain redeeming features in the character of Nanjarāja. He was hard working, unsparing, dogged and single-minded. He held fast, for instance, to the idea of Chikkadēvarāja that Southern India was politically doomed if there was no leadership at all in it—and there had been none in it since the death of Śrī-Ranga VI in or about 1681—but only continued rivalry and aimless conflict. The ceaseless fights between the former feudatories of Vijayanagar had weakened the country and had opened the way to the inroads of the Northern States. The lesson that Vijayanagar had taught during a course of over four centuries had been forgotten. Gingee had fallen; Madura had been tottering; and Tanjore had

been overrun. The Mughal forces had followed in the wake of Bijāpur and Gōlkoṇḍa. These in their turn had fallen and the Mahrattas under Śivāji had seized hold of the opportunity to obtain control in the South. The fight between Mysore, the one organized State which had inherited the Vijayanagar tradition and which had succeeded in part in its mission to continue it in a manner suited to the altered conditions, and the rest of the old feudatories or their successors, the Mughal and the Mahratta, continued much to the detriment and well-being of the country. During this continued period of turmoil and strife, there should have been not a few who should have observed and reflected that these ceaseless fights between the people of the South—who had been for generations accustomed to the peaceful life of Vijayanagar times—meant no more than civil war. They should have realized the evils of such war and their own impotence before the invading hosts from the North. If Chikkadēva was the first to discern these evils and the first to take decisive steps to avert them by a southward movement, with the definite aim of the unification of the whole of the South on the Vijayanagar model, Nanjarāja was the next and must be reckoned the last to follow it up with a persistency that reflected the greatest credit on him. He saw in the forces contending for supremacy in the South that if he missed the opportunity that had offered itself to him—the secret treaty with Muhammad Alī is the true index of the spirit that animated him—the continued civil strife that had stifled life and destroyed the peace of the country would continue longer and end in making the invading Mughal or his representative the arbiter of destiny to the people of Southern India. That was the very thing that Chikkadēva had originally tried to prevent, and it was the identical thing that Nanjarāja had with singular tenacity stuck to. But there was this

difference between the two: Chikkadēva knew the limits to which he could go, while Nanjarāja, in his eagerness to win through, set no bounds to his action. There is, however, something to be said in defence of Nanjarāja. The position had worsened during the period of sixty years that had elapsed since the death of Chikkadēva. Muslim control of the South had been tightened by the creation of two Nawābships—Sīra and Arcot—in place of one. The Mahrattas had established themselves as a power at Tanjore. The Nizām had become independent and claimed control over the South. Foreign nations like the English and French had shown no disinclination to take sides between the contending parties. All things thus pointed to the continuance of the prevailing conflict. Nanjarāja saw that there was no hope for the South so long as these conditions lasted. He accordingly was daily being confirmed in his conviction that a final attempt at the capture of Trichinopoly, the key to the southern supremacy, was a dire necessity. He saw that there was no other way to avoid the subjection of the South to the foreigner. That would be both a scandal and a misery. There must have been many in the land who should have still remembered the splendid glories of Vijayanagar and recalled how it had proved a bulwark against the aggressions of the North. The representative of that great Empire was still in the land, though he bore but an attenuated rule in it. The early terrors inspired by the Muslim name had died ages ago. The Muslim had been fought repeatedly and defeated. Those who remembered these things came to believe not only in the justice of their cause but also in the possibility of the success of a well-organized campaign against those who were eager to wrest the power from its rightful owners. In any case, it seemed out of the question that South India could be subjected to foreign supremacy while there was yet a chance to secure its independence.

Nanjarāja, the symbol of the independence of the South.

The idea was thus deepening that it would be intolerable to see South India surrendered to the foreigner while an opportunity was yet available to keep him out of it. Nanjarāja was the symbol of that idea. He embraced it openly and stood out for it actively. He was emboldened in his venture by the signal defeat that his brother Dēvarājaiya had inflicted on the combined forces of the Nawābs of Sīra and Arcot only about fifteen years ago (1737). Nor could he have forgotten the success of Chikkadēvarāja against Madura and the occupation of the country up to Trichinopoly. Since Chikkadēva's time, it was the one ambition of the rulers of Mysore to seize Trichinopoly and control the whole country to the south of it, as far as Cape Comorin, as one kingdom in the interests of the people inhabiting it, free from outside interference, free from external control, and free to develop their own culture and civilization. The idea was by no means either a new one or an impossible one to attain. The Hoysaḷas and the Vijayanagar monarchs had done it before and Chikkadēva had all but succeeded in it. And people who remembered the state of the country for three quarters of a century backward to 1673 could not but have welcomed a project of the kind that Nanjarāja had in view. It was not so much a war of conquest that he contemplated as a war to retain the liberty of self-growth that had been sanctified by centuries of exercise by past rulers in the south of India. And if they had succeeded and wielded undisputed supremacy for ages, why should he (Nanjarāja) not do the same? The time seemed propitious and he had the sinews of war. Nanjarāja saw that with the death of Aurangzīb, the one obstacle in the way to the realization of Mysore's objective had disappeared. The terror of the Mughal name was dead long ago. He did not think

much of the Mahratta opposition. It could be put off; or it could be even bought off. Bijāpur, Gōlkoṇḍa and the rest of them had gone for good. Their pretended successors, the Nizāms and the Nawābs, were fighting among themselves. Nor did he reckon the opposition of the Nizāms or the Nawābs of Arcot and Sīra as anything serious. They had still to earn their reputation. He had a large army and he had enough money. Chikkadēva's treasure would seem to have been gathered for this special purpose. And he thought that diplomacy would do the rest. He thus saw that his duty to his country could be discharged, if at all, just at the time he inaugurated his campaign (1751). Only recent events had made him feel uneasy, as they should have made many others like him, if they could have any idea as to what foreign domination once again would mean in the South. The extinction of the Nāyak Dynasty of Madura in 1736 had been followed by the occupation of Trichinopoly, Diṇḍigal, Madura and Tinnevelly by the forces of Chandā Sāhib and even Tanjore had been subjugated. The Mahratta success of 1740-1743 had proved only an interlude and no more. The defeat of Chandā Sāhib and the reoccupation of Trichinopoly and the appointment of Murāri Rao to it did not prove of permanent value to the Hindu cause. Murāri Rao vacated his office in 1743 and the Nizām's nominee Anwar-ud-dīn occupied the country and claimed to rule over the whole of the South through his sons Mahfūz Khān and Muhammad Alī. Rival Muhammadan parties claimed to rule. Madura, the ancient Hindu capital, had been occupied by one Ālam Khān, a supporter of Chandā Sāhib, and had withstood a siege in 1751. Nanjarāja was a close witness to all these misfortunes that the ancient Hindu capital underwent. Anarchy prevailed in the country round about it, and those who recalled the glories of its past, could not but have wished for a day

of the old Hindu règime. Nor would they have wished for a continuance of the foreign rule which meant so much misery to the people accustomed to their temples, festivals and religious observances. If he only acted with vigour and nerve, Nanjarāja felt—like many others of the time—that he could drive the intruders out as Kampaṇṇa Woḍeyar, the Vijayanagar Prince, had done before him four centuries ago. If he failed to strike a blow then—about 1751—he would have failed in his duty and, what is worse, would have lost his only opportunity. All eyes in the South should have turned to him as the only man who could undertake so great a task. His reputation stood high; he commanded universal respect in the South; he had the necessary equipment; and, what is more, he commanded in an ample measure the required resources. If he declined to try, he would have not only lagged behind in carrying out the ambitions of Chikkadēva but also have failed to do his duty towards his country and his people. His name and fame were at stake and he had to act, whether he liked it or no. The only other alternatives were subjection to the outsider, and negotiations to win over some of those whom he had perforce to fight if he was to attain his objective. The first, according to Nanjarāja, was out of the question. He had inherited a life-long passion for the freedom of the South, and he could not well sacrifice it. As to winning over the Mahrattas—they being competitors against him in the pursuit of supremacy over the South—it was plainly equally out of the question. The Mahrattas failed to recognise that Mysore was better situated to control the South and that a friendly Mysore was preferable to a fighting Mysore. The Mahrattas since Shāhji's time had both a personal and an imperial attitude which prevented them from leaving the South to Mysore and thus making common cause against the foreigner. That is where

Mahratta politics went wrong from the days of Śivāji. In these circumstances, what was the peculiar mission of Mysore that it could not be left to itself because of the hostility of the Mahrattas? What could not have been achieved by leadership by Mysore aided by the Mahrattas in the South? But if the Mahrattas stood out for themselves, was Mysore to hold back at the critical hour? That was the question that evidently troubled Nanjarāja. And he stood out for the cause of his country and his religion—of which he was an ardent interpreter and a zealous follower—and decided upon action in the full belief he would succeed. It was not mere personal ambition that carried Nanjarāja to the course of action on which he staked his name, fame, and all. He profoundly believed in the greatness of the cause he had made his own; in the greatness of his country as the guardian of Hindu culture, religion and civilisation; and in the greatness of the idea that had impelled action on the part of Chikkadēva. Both his writings and his actions show that he was a lover of his country, its religion and its culture, and that he stood for them all. Indeed, as we shall see, he had so far infused enthusiasm in the justice of his cause in Haidar that, despite the fact that he was a Muhammadan himself, Haidar, when he came to occupy Nanjarāja's place, tried to prosecute the latter's policy and objective with all the vigour and singleness of purpose he was capable of. In fact Haidar stepped into a rich national heritage and proved the greatest opponent of the greatest outside power in the land.

His fatal mistake: lack of planning and preparation for war.

If Nanjarāja can be justified in his idea of a war against those who kept him out of Trichinopoly, he can hardly be commended for the manner in which he prosecuted his claims. As we have seen, he did not plan beforehand his campaign with a view to success;

he did not realise the importance of initiative in war. He showed no foresight whatever in the conduct of the war; he waited till something had happened and then tried to circumvent it. That was not the way to win a war. No wonder, then, the cause he stood for suffered from his lack of common military prudence. The idea of an independent South headed by Mysore in face of the expanding power of the foreigner thus ended in humiliation, he himself in the end paying the last price of resistance.

The man and his idea: a justification.

There is something truly tragic in the end that overtook Nanjarāja. But the man was nothing; the idea he stood for was great in itself and deserved to succeed. His *modus operandi* may have gone wrong but his policy was right and in keeping with the spirit of the times. The man who staked his all on it cannot but deserve a meed of praise from posterity. For, after the disaster of Trichinopoly, there was no more political liberty in the south of India. The issue between Nanjarāja and Muhammad Alī was really a conflict between a free Southern India and a fettered Southern India; a Southern India with its own culture and civilization, and a Southern India under the control of foreigners. Nanjarāja in his efforts to save the South exhausted himself and Mysore of its resources. It would be idle to speculate on "what might have been" had he succeeded in his attempt. How long would such success have been kept up by him or by those who followed him? How far would it have changed the current of history? Who can venture to answer questions of this nature? It would be as profitable to ask what would have happened if Demosthenes had succeeded and Philip had lost Chæronea. But it is impossible, despite all his faults and deficiencies, to withhold from Nanjarāja our admiration for striking a final blow for the

political independence of the South. While the attempt lasted, he was the hero of the South. All eyes had turned to him for driving the foreigner out of the land. There can be no question that popular goodwill was on his side in this attempt. He had not only persuaded himself of the need for such a venture but had also persuaded Murāri Rao for the moment to join him, though the latter proved a traitor later, and all the country from Mysore to Trichinopoly had joined him. That is an achievement that, despite the failure that overtook him, stands to his credit and to the credit of the people of South India. Nanjarāja's defeat at Trichinopoly has to be deplored, because it opened the way to the South passing under the sway of the foreigner, who eventually had himself to make way for another stronger than himself. What the success of Muhammad Alī meant was not seen in 1755 when Nanjarāja turned his back from Trichinopoly but in 1756 when the English won at Plassey and laid the foundation for their rule not only in Bengal but all over India. From every point of view—from that of the victor and the vanquished—the success of Muhammad Alī at Trichinopoly has to be characterised as a "dishonest victory." There is enough in contemporary records to prove that if it was not obtained exactly by open fraud and violence to truth, it was made possible by recourse to prevarication, unjust putting off and rank dissimulation which deceived nobody except those who indulged in it. So far as Nanjarāja is concerned, it must be frankly confessed that even if the ultimate issue of his fight for Trichinopoly was known to him beforehand, if all the South had known what it must be, even then, it has to be admitted that Mysore could not have turned from the course she followed. She was to take account of her then position in the South; of her name and fame; of what Chikkadēva had done; of what Vijayanagar,

her predecessor, had done for ages; and of what the future had in store for her and others in the South. It is not possible to adjudge that Nanjarāja was wrong in choosing to risk his country, his wealth, his name, his fame, his all for the freedom and safety of all in the South of India. That that should be the final verdict of history on him there can be no doubt whatever.

Nanjarāja and Bolingbroke: a comparison and a contrast.

In some respects, Nanjarāja resembled his elder contemporary Bolingbroke, the great Tory hero.[94] Both favoured separate and secret negotiations for what they considered the good of their countries; both were fond of carrying on underhand conspiracies—secret talks with the enemy rather than open conferences with the allies; both brought discredit on their countries by their indecision, cross intrigues and doubtful diplomacies; both proved unfaithful to their respective sovereigns; both endeavoured by dubious means to gain supreme power and to keep it by any means, and by any

94. Bolingbroke, Henry St. John, Viscount (1678-1751). Tory Prime Minister of Queen Anne, after the dismissal of the Whigs. Much has been written on him since his own times. Besides contemporary accounts of his life, the following modern biographies may be noted: Leslie Stephen, *Dict. of Nat. Biog.*, 1897; C. de Remusat in *L'Angleterre au 18 me sixcte*, I, 1856; T. Macknight, 1863; J. Churton Collins, 1886; A. Hassal, 1889; Walter Sichel, 1901-1902; P. C. Yorke, *Enc. Brit.*, 11th Edn., 1910-1911; and Sir Charles Petrie (Collins), 1937. Alexander Pope wrote his first famous work, "*Essay on Man*", at Bolingbroke's suggestion, and devoted it to an exposition of that virtuoso's philosophy. The tone and temper of this philosophy is best expressed in this *Essay* with its twin assertions that "whatever is is right" and that

> "For forms of Government, let fools contest;
> Whate'er is best administered is best."

As Mr. G. D. H. Cole has remarked, not only the early 18th century was really indifferent about forms of Government, but also it regarded political authority as too securely settled in the hands of the aristocracy for its nature to be worth much argument.

Nanjarāja was in power between 1739-1759. Bolingbroke entered Parliament in 1701; became Secretary for War, 1704; Secretary of State, 1710; Prime Minister, on the dismissal of the Earl of Oxford, 1714; dismissed from office on the accession of George I; fled to Paris, March 28, 1715 returned to London, 1723; retired to France, June 1735; returned to England and settled at Battersea, 1744; died, December 12, 1751.

act that the circumstances demanded; both had literary inclinations and produced works which still count for something, though they make a far weaker impression upon posterity than they evidently made on contemporaries; and the political wisdom of both was *ex post facto* and often in direct contrast to their actions. There were, however, some points of difference as well between Nanjarāja and Bolingbroke. Throughout his career, Bolingbroke desired to be considered the Petronius or the Alcibiades of his age and to mix licentious orgies with the highest political responsibilities. Nanjarāja was far too religious and far too puritanical in his outlook to become so accomplished a voluptuary as these old world worthies were. Nor did he, like Bolingbroke, patronise Providence, though, proud as Lucifer, he did seem at times to assume the superior air and appear condescending indeed. It is uncertain if Nanjarāja had the brilliant gift of eloquence that Bolingbroke was blessed with; nor Bolingbroke's wit, good looks and social qualities, which made firm friendships with men of the most opposite character. Nanjarāja had, however, some saving features in his character, while Bolingbroke's public life presents none of those acts of devotion and self-sacrifice which so often help to redeem a career characterized by errors, follies and even crimes.

The Daḷavāi brothers: an estimate of their work.

Thus, with all their greed, insensate ambition and love of power, it is indeed to the credit of the Dāḷavāi brothers that they were able to divert their attention from the immediate preoccupations of the hour and devote themselves whole-heartedly to the solution of broader questions of policy. During the early years of the reign (1734-1751), they not only kept a steady eye on the westward and southward expansion of Mysore (up to Malabar and Trichinopoly) but also took a keen interest

in the maintenance of the territorial integrity and independence of the kingdom as against the pretensions to supremacy[95] and inroads of the Mughals and the Mahrattas on the one side and the assertions of some of the local potentates on the other. In the latter direction, they achieved, on the whole, a fair measure of success, enhancing the reputation and prestige of the State and attaining to the plenitude of their power and glory (1748-1751).

The credit due to them.

The acquisition of Trichinopoly for conserving the political solidarity of the South was the main objective of the foreign policy of the Daḷavāis—particularly of Karāchūri Nanjarājaiya—during 1751-1755, a period of uncommon stress and turmoil in the Karnāṭak and Southern India. They had inherited it from Chikkadēva's time. They had to fight for it; they had to die for it, if the South was to be at all free politically. They staked everything for their idea and they lost their all over it. Around this issue was centred the tenacious and protracted Mysorean struggle they carried on during a period of four long years (1752-1755). Notwithstanding his best efforts over this enterprise, Nanjarājaiya met with little success. His failure was, as we have seen, due as much to lack of initiative in war on his part as to the flagrant breach of faith and shifting policy of Muhammad Alī, the uncertain movements and changing allegiance of Murāri Rao of Gooty, the persistent opposition and hostility of Pratāp Singh of Tanjore, the ultimate combination of the English and the French against him (during 1754-1755), and the pressure of the Nizām and the Mahrattas on Seringapatam demanding his immediate presence at the capital. There is reason to fear that his brother Dēvarājaiya, who looked after

95. For a fuller notice of the nature of sovereignty of the Indian powers of the 18th century over the South, see Ch. XVI below; also Appendix V—(3) to this Vol.

the home affairs during this period of warfare, failed in his duty and allowed the enemy to march on the capital while the war was still on at Trichinopoly. There were also serious defects in the character of Nanjarājaiya —over-confidence in the justice of his cause, unjustified reliance on French support, and vacillation, indecision and intrigue in the prosecution of his scheme—and these contributed directly to the collapse of what was otherwise a well-conceived project of political expansion.[96]

Results of the disaster at Trichinopoly.

End of the Daḷavāi Règime and the emergence of Haidar Alī.

The disaster that overtook the foreign policy of the Daḷavāis, accompanied by the exactions of the Nizām and the Mahrattas from the kingdom of Mysore, had the immediate effect of draining the resources of the State and reacting adversely on the court of Seringapatam (1755). It was too late when Krishṇarāja Woḍeyar, realising the gravity of the situation, sought to assert himself (1755-1757) and adjust his relations with the Daḷavāis on a new footing (1758). The attempt, though purely a temporary palliative, proved eventually a failure. It led to the end of the Daḷavāi règime and paved the way for the rise to prominence of a more powerful usurper in the person of Haidar Alī from the lower ranks of the military (1759). Indeed, it was an irony of fate that almost at a time when Krishṇarāja Woḍeyar was about to inaugurate his independent rule, Haidar had become a power in Mysore (1759-1760). In vain did Krishṇarāja with the Royalists exert himself to the utmost to hold his own against Haidar during 1760-1761. Haidar's usurpation was complete in July 1761—the net result of the action and reaction of a long course of affairs, external and internal (1750-1761).

96. In this connection, it is significant to note that Karāchūri Nanjarājaiya had maintained a regular journal of his transactions ever since he set out from Mysore [see *Count. Corres.* (1753), p. 30: *Letter* No. 19, dated February 27, 1753—Daḷavāi to Capt. Dalton]. Unfortunately, however, this record has not come to light so far.

Krishṇarāja Woḍeyar II as he might have been.

Krishṇarāja Woḍeyar, as he appears from the materials available to us, was a pious and promising ruler. Under other circumstances, he should have fared differently. The Daḷavāis too were noted for their piety and for their patronage of learning and promotion of literary activity, Karāchūri Nanjarājaiya being himself an accomplished scholar of the age. Had they but behaved loyally towards their sovereign, allowed him a legitimate share in the management of State affairs, planned carefully, worked vigorously, exacted what was due from their allies and acted generally with greater discretion during 1746-1755, the course of the history of Mysore, nay of South India, would have run along different lines.